Practising refusal as relating otherwise: engagements with knowledge production, 'activist' praxis, and borders

This special issue explores the concept of refusal through academic and personal reflections, conversation, poetry, activism, and performative practice. In this introduction, we first situate practices of refusal within very specific locations of struggle and then frame these refusals as a practice of *relating otherwise*. Relating otherwise is a 'mode of engagement' – not a theory or method – that shapes relationships with ourselves, each other, and the world. The introduction goes on to discuss how refusal practices engage with (1) decolonial modes of knowing, (2) embodied, situated, and relational ways of meaning-making, and (3) the undoing of existing dichotomies within 'activist' practice.

Keywords: practices of refusal, relating otherwise, knowledge production, 'activist' praxis, borders

Introduction

A wide range of disciplines have recently engaged with the concept of *refusal*. While the term was first coined by Indigenous studies scholars (Simpson 2007, 2014, 2016, 2017; Coulthard 2014), many others have since contributed to its conceptualisation. This includes interventions from scholars within anti-Blackness studies (Campt 2017a, 2017b, 2019; da Silva 2018; Shange 2019; Karera 2021; Nxumalo 2021); pedagogical and educational studies (Fine *et al*. 2013; Tuck & Yang 2014; Rodríguez 2019; Martino & Omercajic 2021; Raymond & Canham 2022); geography, environmental, and discard studies (Zahara 2016; Joly *et al*. 2018; Wright 2018); anthropology and cultural studies (Murphy 2017; Rowe & Tuck 2017; McGranahan 2018; Prasse-Freeman 2022); gender, women's, and sexuality studies (Cahill *et al*. 2019; Mengesha & Padmanabhan 2019); and migration, refugee, and border studies (Jones 2012; Wrightson 2020; Newhouse 2021; Coultas 2022; Mitchell-Eaton & Coddington 2022; Meier 2023).

These contributions – particularly from Indigenous and Black feminist writers, activists, and thinkers – inspired this special issue. This project grew out of an ongoing interdisciplinary dialogue about refusal as a tool for understanding and conceptualising "everyday practices of struggle" (Campt 2019, 80). Our thinking about refusal also emerged from our engagement with different movements against borders and our involvement in diverse anti-racist, trans-feminist, and abolitionist activist

URN:NBN:fi:tsv-oa137167
DOI: 10.11143/fennia.137167

collectives and spaces (e.g. Feminist Autonomous Centre for research 2023, the Feminist No Borders Summer School) and anti-racist No Borders/border abolition groups mobilising for a world without borders and prisons.

In August 2021, we chaired a Royal Geographical Society (RGS) conference session to reflect on the politics of refusal in the context of border struggles. We asked how differently situated subjects enact refusal in their struggles against a transnational regime that tries to impose borders into our everyday lives. We have witnessed a politics of refusal to negotiate racial and colonial dominance embedded in the state, humanitarian agencies, and transnational corporations in the context of the so-called 'refugee crisis' and the EU's hotspot border management. We developed the idea for this *Fennia* special issue from the RGS session and our continued contemplation of the following questions: How can we refuse the reproduction of border(s) within our own research? How can we think, feel, act, and write refusal as rooted in the desire for a methodological and epistemological shift and wider border abolition (Spathopoulou & Meier 2020; Meier 2023).

Most of the contributing authors engage with refusal practices in the context of borders in a broader sense. This includes nation-state/territorial borders; borders within activism, academia and research; embodied and affective borders; borders between theory and practice; research and art; and between human and more-than-human world. The special issue brings together voices, experiences, and knowledges from a wide range of places – India, Malaysia, Uganda, Greece, the United Kingdom (UK), Norway, Sweden, Canada, Iran, Afghanistan, France, and the United States (US). Rather than viewing borders as static entities/lines with a determinate geographical location (at the boundary edges of nation states), this collection contributes to scholarship interrogating the ways in which borders become inscribed on people's bodies and everyday lives in racialised and gendered ways.

This special issue encourages readers to reflect on how practices of refusal are a starting point for "speculative gestures towards a horizon of border abolition, drawing on prefigurative, imaginative, and representational acts that seek to collectively deborder spaces and embodied subjectivities" (Carastathis *et al*. forthcoming). As Anderson, Sharma, and Wright (2009, 11) note in their special issue, 'No Borders as Practical Politics', "the recognition and naming of people's refusals to accept borders is of crucial importance in the light of the typical response to calls for No Borders [as] utopian and impractical". In other words, the "everyday practice of refusing the border has existed as long as borders have" (Anderson *et al*. 2009, 11). Many contributions in this special issue affirm exactly this: struggles against borders are existing, ongoing, and everyday abolitionist practices of refusal; they are not utopias.

This special issue is the product of much work and labour of love from many people: the brilliant authors, the generous reviewers, *Fennia*'s editors, and us, the guest editors. This global and interdisciplinary collection of beautiful papers, essays, personal reflections, and interventions engages with (1) decolonial modes of knowing, (2) embodied, situated, and relational ways of meaning-making, and (3) the undoing of existing dichotomies within 'activist' practice. This introduction frames these engagements – with knowledges, meaning-making, and 'activist' practice – as practices of *relating otherwise*; they embody different ways of relating to ourselves, others, and the world. This special issue includes many artistic, visual, poetic, and conversational contributions, which help us unlearn the rigid structures of 'academic' writing and dissolve the hierarchies between theory and empirical 'data' and between researchers and what/who is researched. The variety of formats and wide range of differently situated voices, experiences, and knowledges is an important feature of our collective reflections on the importance of decolonial, creative, and embodied modes of knowing and being.

We selected *Fennia* as a non-profit open access journal to publish with as it allows us to work with so many different publication formats. It was important to us to be able to integrate essays, personal reflections, intervention pieces, conversations and creative contributions including poetry, with more traditional research articles. This encourages the inclusion of differently situated voices and refuses the unequal epistemic and methodological barriers between those 'inside' and 'outside' of higher education institutions (also BRIDGES Collective 2022). As such, refusal is both the *content* and *method* of this special issue. As Nayak (2019, 354–355) has shown, "method and content are mutually constitutive and mutually contingent"; as such, "traditional fragmentation or partition between action and thinking, practice and epistemology or activism and theory are transgressed". In other words, our

approach to this special issue, rather than being something distinct or exterior to its content and the different positionalities that we embody, became an interconnected space of engagement. Throughout the making, from its conception to the production process, we returned to ideas of transgressing binaries between theory–praxis/activism, writing–research, outside–inside universities, logocentric–embodied, and individual–collective.

We undertook extensive reflections and efforts to challenge the epistemic violence (e.g. in terms of included voices, formats and languages) reproduced through academic publishing. Nevertheless, we still encountered the constraints of 'scholarly standards' required by an international academic journal. This included concerns with language editing requirements, terminology, and a distinction between 'academic papers' and 'political intervention pieces'. We appreciated the journal editor's openness and ongoing dialogue with requests to make exceptions and slightly loosen these constraints.

This introduction proceeds as follows: the next section situates practices of refusal within very specific locations of struggle – ongoing settler colonialism, Indigenous struggles for land and sovereignty, and anti-Blackness and Black struggles for freedom and survival. We then preview how our contributors engage with refusal as a 'mode of engagement' in (1) decolonial ways of knowing, (2) embodied, situated, and relational ways of meaning-making, and (3) the undoing of existing dichotomies within 'activist' practice. The final section discusses the overall contribution of the special issue.

Practices of refusal and their specific locations of struggle

In 2007, Indigenous scholar Simpson (2007, 104–105) coined the term 'ethnographic refusal'[1] to describe a methodology that "acknowledges asymmetrical power relations" and "refuses to write in a way that might compromise hard won and always precarious tribal sovereignty". Her writings question the ethics, politics, and theories underpinning ethnographic research, which she contextualises within ongoing systems and logics of settler colonialism that justify the acquisition of bodies, territories, and knowledge (see Maldonado-Torres 2007; Simpson 2007; Tuck & Yang 2014). Simpson draws attention to the Mohawk people's refusal to engage with juridical categories that evolved from colonial violence and dispossession and explores how their acts of refusal demand other political orders. The Mohawk people's refusal to 'play the game' recognises broader power imbalances entrenched in existing orders; it exposes the falsity of the underlying promise of their inclusion and agency within the system (Simpson 2017). These practices of refusal are generative in that they constitute a "redirection to ideas otherwise unacknowledged or unquestioned" (Tuck & Yang 2014, 239). Simpson (2017, 21) also frames refusal as a "theory of the political" that has been "pronounced over and over again." Many scholars have since used Simpson's concept of ethnographic refusal to "redirect academic analysis away from harmful pain-based narratives that obscure slow violence and towards the structures, institutions, and practices that engender those narratives" (Zahara 2016, para. 2)

Indigenous scholars' engagement with practices of refusal has always been situated within the specific physical, spiritual, and psychological violence of ongoing settler colonialism (Simpson 2007, 2014, 2016; Coulthard 2014). As Simpson and Coulthard argue, settler colonialism seeks to "undermine, deny, and otherwise overwrite Indigenous peoples' practices and assertions of sovereignty, including through legislative and juridical violence" (as cited in Wrightson 2020, 195). The two authors position practices of refusal as part of Indigenous sovereignty and the 'unruly' theories and practices of 'being' and 'doing' (Raheja 2015, 28). Similarly, Simpson (2015, 19) argues that "Indigenous thought, which is as diverse as the land itself, roots sovereignty in good relationships, responsibilities and deep respect for individual and collective self-determination, and honoring diversity". In short, Indigenous scholars' engagement with practices of refusal is rooted in a practice of relating differently to land and place.

Indigenous scholars' engagement with practices of refusal has always been situated within the specific physical, spiritual, and psychological violence of ongoing settler colonialism (Simpson 2007, 2014, 2016; Coulthard 2014). As Simpson and Coulthard argue, settler colonialism seeks to "undermine, deny, and otherwise overwrite Indigenous peoples' practices and assertions of sovereignty, including through legislative and juridical violence" (as cited in Wrightson 2020, 195). The two authors position practices of refusal as part of Indigenous sovereignty and the 'unruly' theories and practices of 'being'

and 'doing' (Raheja 2015, 28). Similarly, Simpson (2015, 19) argues that "Indigenous thought, which is as diverse as the land itself, roots sovereignty in good relationships, responsibilities and deep respect for individual and collective self-determination, and honoring diversity". In short, Indigenous scholars' engagement with practices of refusal is rooted in a practice of relating differently to land and place.

Coulthard's (2014) *Red Skin, White Masks* calls for a conceptual shift and reorientation in texts and thinking about settler colonialism – from "struggles *for* land [... to ...] struggles that are *informed* by land (Coulthard 2010, 78 in Wrightson 2020). He argues that "it is a profound misunderstanding to think of land or place as simply some material object of profound importance to Indigenous cultures (although it is this too); instead it ought to be understood as a field of 'relationships of things to each other'" (Coulthard 2010, 79). Land, according to Coulthard, is a physical manifestation of relationships as practised and lived. He also emphasises the generative nature of refusal: "enacting Indigenous alternatives on the ground will bring us into productive confrontation with the colonial structures of exploitation and domination" (Coulthard in Gardner & Clancy 2017, para. 16).

Another strand of thinking on practices of refusal emerged from anti-Blackness studies. Contemporary writers such as Tina Campt, Saidiya Hartman, Denise Ferreira da Silva, Christina Sharpe, Fred Moten, and Alexander G. Weheliye trace the genealogy of refusal back through a long tradition of Black feminist activists and thinkers. The Combahee River Collective's (1977, 210) 'The Genesis of Contemporary Black Feminism' affirms that Black women such as Sojourner Truth, Harriet Tubman, Frances E. W. Harper, Ida B. Wells-Barnett, and Mary Church Terrell have "always embodied, if only in their physical manifestation, an adversary stance to white male rule and have actively resisted its inroads upon them and their communities in both dramatic and subtle ways". Anti-Blackness scholarship draws on such Black feminist abolitionists and Black radical thinkers (e.g. Frantz Fanon, Sylvia Wynter, Audre Lorde, and Hortense Spillers) when conceptualising refusal as a way to disengage from structures of anti-Black violence. It is "the refusal to be a subject to a law that refuses to recognize you. Its [*sic*.] defined not by opposition or necessarily resistance, but instead a refusal of the very premises that have historically negated the lived experience of Blackness as either pathological or exceptional to the logic of white supremacy" (Barnard Centre for Research on Women 2014 quoted in Sojoyner 2017, 527).

In 2015, Campt and Hartman created the Practicing Refusal Collective to initiate a new exploratory dialogue on anti-Blackness in the twenty-first century. Campt's (2019, 80) article, 'Black visuality and the practice of refusal', frames the Collective's work as a "desire to think through and toward refusal as a generative and capacious rubric for theorizing everyday practices of struggle often obscured by an emphasis on collective acts of resistance". For the Collective, practices of refusal entail "the urgency of rethinking the time, space, and fundamental vocabulary of what constitutes politics, activism, and theory, as well as what it means to refuse the terms given to us to name these struggles" (*ibid*.). Refusal is a practice of engaging with politics, activism, and theory otherwise. Collective member da Silva (2018) draws on Spillers to conceptualise refusal as a *praxis and theory* that dis/orders colonial, racial, and heteropatriarchal systems of violence. She frames refusal as a 'mode of engagement', a practice of engaging differently that spans day-to-day life, political practice, activism, and academia.

Indigenous engagements and Black feminist thinkers remind us to contemplate refusal as "everyday practices of struggle" (Campt 2019, 80). Refusal presents openings to rethink how we engage with politics, activism, and theory, as well as the wider political frameworks that have strictly delineated these engagements. Refusal practices are a 'mode of engagement', not an act of academic or activist practice – they help us think beyond theory-practice dichotomies (e.g. being 'actively' and 'passively' engaged, figures of research like the scholar, activist, and/or participant). It also reveals the creative and generative nature of refusals as practices to create different realities and ways of relating.

Engaging with decolonial modes of knowing

It has been eleven years since Tuck and Yang first published their widely influential piece, 'Decolonization is not a metaphor'. The essay critiqued the way in which "the language of decolonization has been superficially adopted into education and other social sciences" (Tuck &

Yang 2021, 2) but has not challenged or refused underlying colonial frameworks. This special issue hopes to encourage further dialogue on how colonial modes of knowing and being affect every aspect of our lives as writers, thinkers, and activists. The contributions draw on a long tradition of activism by Black and Indigenous feminist theory to challenge what counts as legitimate knowledge and who is granted the right to produce and receive it. Many of the contributions interrogate dominant forms of knowledge production and its roots in the coloniality of Western philosophy and 'modernity' (Wynter 1979; also Cusicanqui 2010; Lugones 2010; Mignolo 2011). They explore "ways of being and knowing that are not shackled by colonial and imperialist politics of knowledge production" (Dutta 2023, 548). They refuse to accept universality, researcher objectivity, and what Quijano calls the coloniality of knowledge – "the mechanisms by which Eurocentric canons of knowledge produced in the Global North become legitimised as the only valid ones" (Quijano 2000 quoted in BRIDGES Collective 2022, 10).

We, the authors of this introduction, passed through the German and Greek hegemonic school system, entered higher education, and now teach and research at academic institutions in the United Kingdom. As hooks (1994) reminds us, these European (higher) education systems are inherently colonial. We inhabit uncomfortable positions as so-called 'scholars', a term that denotes a kind of intellectual superiority. Therefore, it is important for us to acknowledge our own positionality within these institutions and how our financial survival depends on them. In other words, our subjectivities are shaped by certain privileges gained from being inside and, at least partially, recognised within and by higher education institutions. Privileges drawn along the lines of race, class, and ableism have facilitated our access into these spaces. Crucially, certain bodies move/transit easily/smoothly within universities, while others encounter numerous obstacles impeding their very entry and survival within. In colonial modes of knowing, some people become perpetual "onlookers while others are always gazed upon" (Dutta 2023, 545).

Esfandyar Torkaman Rad's (2023) contribution to this special issue – *Radical understanding: reflections on knowledge production, power, positionality, and practices of refusal within academic research* – explores how People of Colour researchers must adhere to specific rules and norms to thrive in higher education institutions. As a PhD researcher in France, Torkaman Rad was encouraged to assume the role of 'native informant', which "is inscribed as evidence in the production of the scientific or disciplinary European knowledge of the culture of Others: from field-work through [theorising]" (Spivak 1999, 66–67 in Torkaman Rad 2023, 255). Moreover, Torkaman Rad (2023, 255) unpacks how he had to "prove his assimilation" and integrate the "*right* methods of knowledge production". He was repeatedly confronted with the assumption that it is "always the dominants who produce knowledge *about* the dominated, that the South provides the 'field' and the North the theory" (Khosravi 2019 in Torkaman Rad 2023, 255). His intervention talks us through his unfolding PhD research journey and his own practices of refusing dominant methods of knowledge production as a way of relating to research otherwise.

Vita Zelenska's (2023) contribution, A*n article that refuses to write itself*, reflects on the process of researching and writing an article about carceral migration contexts in Greece to question academic knowledge production on migration. Zelenska (2023, 263–264) reflects on their positionality as researcher and activist to critique the paternalistic framing of those with migration 'experience' as both "knowledgeable subjects" and "instrumentalised objects of knowledge": "Migrants and refugees [...] are often expected [...] to convey knowledge in a certain way, that is most often the knowledge of suffering and struggles". This article includes sections of previous drafts to discuss how the paper refused to write itself in ways that "both re-create the all too old separation in ethnography between the self and the 'other', albeit in different ways [...] while the first one re-produces the romanticised figure of the resistant subject, the second one possibly contributes to the ghosting of migrants and refugees as it chooses the 'local' as the one who is making the refusal 'on behalf of'" (Zelenska 2023, 264). The text embodies the author's own struggles and conflicts as an engaged scholar researching knowledge production on migration and their attempts to avoid reproducing the state's binaries of 'migrant' and 'citizen/local'. Zelenska's contribution asks who counts as a legitimate subject of knowledge production on migration and how 'migrant' figures are reproduced through various representations and discourses.

Lena Gross, Sepandarmaz Mashreghi, and Emma Söderman's article, *Refusal – opening otherwise forms of research*, reflects on their individual decisions *not* to write about something they encountered in their research. The authors, who are situated within migration and Indigenous studies, converse with Simpson (2007) and Tuck and Young (2014) to explore refusals to "disseminate and/or engage theoretically" with their findings as a "direct disobedience of the principles of academic research, which grants to the academy the inherent right of knowing" (Gross *et al*. 2023, 155). While the authors did not originally adopt ethnographic refusal as a method and/or subject matter, the refusals to "write/ask about" emerged as an "ethical and political choice" throughout their research encounters (Gross *et al*. 2023, 161). These refusals are generative and (re)create a praxis of 're-existence' that led the authors to change their original topics and research questions.

Discussions of 'decolonisation' and a commitment to reforming academic institutions in Europe and North America garnered significant attention after the 2015 #RhodesMustFall student protests and the global Black Lives Matter movement. However, the everyday exclusions unfolding through the dominance of the English language are rarely considered in such debates. The domination of the English language is evident in how knowledge is produced, shared, and published in 'world-class' international journals (see previous Fennia publication on this topic: Kallio & Hyvärinen 2017). Several contributions in this special issue refuse this form of linguistic imperialism by including text, poetry, terminology, and dialogue from other languages. As authors based in the United Kingdom, whose first language is not English, we have experienced this exclusionary effect in academia first-hand. We have had papers rejected for language and grammar issues, been left out of academic engagements, and been subjected to patronising and, at times, infantilising comments. These language-based exclusions intersect with gender, race, and citizenship as well as Central/Northern versus Southern/Eastern European dichotomies, with Women of Colour racialised as migrants experiencing the most severe position of exclusion.

In *Languaging as refusal*, Kolar Aparna and Saba Hamzah ask: 'What is the language of refusal?' The authors consider the power of language and 'languaging' as a practice of "refusal to refuse in one dominant language" (Kramsch *et al*. 2015 in Aparna & Hamzah 2023, 215). They (2023, 216) reflect on their embodied positionalities as mothers, academics, daughters, lovers, and sisters to wonder, "How to speak from our burning guts that refuse to refuse in a language that doesn't speak to our daily lives and struggles?". Aparna and Hamzah engage with texts, experiences, excerpts (from theses-related events), visuals, and poetry combined with biographies, traumas, and memories to reflect on day-to-day experiences in academia and beyond. They (2023, 215, 227) self-define beyond ascribed categories and roles (e.g. the 'bridge of "diversity"' in academia) and invite us to engage in a poetics of refusal as "an ongoing struggle to name our struggles" through *languaging*.

Engagement with embodied, situated, and relational ways of meaning-making

The next section of the special issue attends to enactments of refusal through the embodied, situated, and relational experiences of racialised and gendered people. These refusals highlight how intersecting oppressive structures affect differently situated people, while exploring generative ways of making meaning of lived experiences and creating different knowledges, socialities, and practices of care.

Rapti Siriwardane-de Zoysa, Vani Sreekanta, David Mwambari, Simi Mehta, and Madhurima Majumder consider their positions as scholars, activists, educators, and 'development' practitioners in *The unruly arts of ethnographic refusal: power, politics, performativity*. They draw "metaphoric inspiration from 'unruliness' (of knowing/being) as a deeply embodied and phenomenological notion, which is irreducible as much as it is unteachable" (Rosa 2022 in Siriwardane-de Zoysa *et al*. 2023, 170). The authors (2023, 175) review their ethnographic research praxis across coastal India, Malaysia, and Uganda to consider how "complexities develop because ethnographic research is itself an embodied field of social relations". They (2023, 175) explore how to *creatively work* with refusal, noting that "we bring so much of our own person into encounters, inviting people to bring themselves into a relationship with us and our work". While attending to intersectional hierarchy-

making, they (2023, 180) see practices of refusal as "the revealing of self and others [...] a basic right in safeguarding lifeworlds" that challenges scientific 'objectivity' "as a means of countering as well as reinforcing 'truth-telling.'" Refusal is a "locally situated and historically contingent sensibility" that is performative in nature (Siriwardane-de Zoysa *et al*. 2023, 169). According to the authors, "the arts of seeing, being, and doing refusal [...] may span very embodied practices of refusal, encompassing verbal and non-verbal cues that are rather felt and sensed, than articulated or enacted" (Siriwardane-de Zoysa *et al*. 2023, 179). In other words, "to *sense* as refusal, is as important as learning to read cues that signal moments and spaces of refusal, as fleeting as they may seem" (Siriwardane-de Zoysa *et al*. 2023, 179). This contribution highlights the importance of the sometimes difficult-to-grasp relational, embodied, and situated dimensions of research encounters. It also reveals the creative and transformative capacities of embodied encounters as a space of transformation, (self-) recovery, and healing (also hooks 1991; Simpson 2014, 2016; Nxumalo 2021).

Erene Kaptani's article, *A generative refusal: body inclusive methods with racialized women in knowledge creation,* also explores how to *creatively work* with refusal through the body. Kaptani (2023, 185) draws on examples from her theatre practice and workshops with young women racialised as migrants to conceptualise the body as an act of refusal that challenges dominant logocentric methods in social research and the "Cartesian split between mind and body, rational and irrational". The article is positioned within a long tradition of activism by Black and Indigenous feminist theory as uses body-inclusive theatre-based methods to centre the racialised and gendered body within knowledge production. Embodiment is an important part of research; yet, "an evolved view from the perspective of the moving body has not developed due to the limited research available on body-inclusive methods for social inquiry in the logocentric domination of knowledge production" (Kaptani 2023, 185). Arts-based approaches that centre the moving body and research participants as co-creators "create different spaces of knowledge and ways of making meaning of lived experiences, as well as repeating, and fostering self-definitions" (Kaptani 2023, 186).

Kaptani situates these different knowledges and ways of making meaning within the particular lived experience of everyday bordering (e.g Yuval-Davis *et al*. 2019). She explores how bordering practices 'block' movement: they "do not only remain within the border control and institutional spaces but rather permeate everyday life through gestures, statements, gazes, and spatial arrangements" (Lafazani 2021 in Kaptani 2023, 189; also Noble 2005, 2008). In her article Kaptani (2023, 189) focuses on how gendered and racialised bodies emerge in public spaces and how, "by working with a moving body methodology", the forces creating affective intensities of everyday bordering become visible. This resonates with our own writing on how "bordered reality is material, conceptual, affective, and cognitive; it is not reducible to the geopolitical borders around nation-states but refers to the ways in which states compete and collaborate to run those borders through our bodies in our everyday lives" (Spathopoulou & Carastathis 2020, 4). The border is 'multiplied' as it is 'everywhere' and structures even our most intimate experiences by working through affective registers and occupying emotional and mental space (Meier 2020).

Kathryn Cassidy, Rana Amiri, and Gill Davidson also examine how racialised and gendered borders are inscribed on migrant women's bodies. Their article, *Reading for refusal in UK maternity care: entangling struggles for border and reproductive justice*, discusses practices of refusal within the provision of state maternity services in the UK. The authors demonstrate how migrant women's reproductive lives are specifically targeted by immigration and border regimes in a deeply gendered and racialised "complex of violence" (Pain 2015 quoted in Cassidy *et al*. 2023, xx). This complex of violence includes direct harms, the creation of violent conditions, and violence itself. The authors draw on participant observation and secondary sources to illustrate how refusing early antenatal care opens pathways for bordered women to create the 'care-ful(l) conditions' they need and want during pregnancy; such practices of refusal are not only struggles for reproductive justice, but also border abolition. These care-ful(l) conditions include "the creation of alternative spaces where women could come together to others with similar experiences and be heard; affiliative actions with diverse organisations that the women felt could have a positive impact on their efforts to secure their own lives and those of their children; directly advocating for improved conditions that would alleviate the harms of border and immigration regimes" (Cassidy *et al*. 2023, xx). In refusing the

conditions of National Health Service (NHS) maternity and early antenatal care, migrant women created alternative knowledges, socialities, and care practices/spaces beyond state institutions.

This special issue attempts "to honor the multiple knowledge forms and modalities of knowledge production" (Dutta 2023, 548) situated in the experiences and generative qualities of such embodied refusals. The everyday enactments of refusals included here show how people create alternative and embodied knowledges to self-define, address their needs beyond the state, and create alternative socialities to come together without state institutions. Such refusals generate everyday, abolitionist forms of intersectional care (see Thompson 2021; also FAC 2023) that challenge hegemonic forms of so-called 'care' (e.g. institutional and paternalistic 'care' that controls and borders racialised and gendered women's bodies and manufactured forms of 'care' framed through mainstreamed ethics). Abolitionist care is a praxis that draws on Black feminist principles of care and collectivity; it refuses the care of hegemonic state institutions (including the purported care institutions like hospitals, social work, camps, and asylum centres). We are inspired by Jones's (2022) call for an 'intimate abolitionist movement' that is deeply motivated by commitment, care, and love.

Engagements toward undoing dichotomies within 'activist' practice

The final section of the introduction discusses the importance of undoing dichotomies within 'activist' practice, including common distinctions like 'theory' and 'activism', the 'embodied' and the 'logocentric', 'human' and 'nature', and 'active' and 'passive'. This set of contributions emphasises the need to approach theory-making as fundamentally activist praxis, and activist praxis as an essentially theoretical endeavour. Black feminism has long challenged the distinction between theory and everyday 'activism' (e.g. Combahee River Collective 1977). For example, hooks reclaims theory from academia by revealing the false binary between (feminist) theory and (feminist) practice: "when our lived experience of theorizing is fundamentally linked to processes of self-recovery, of collective liberation, no gap exists between theory and practice. Indeed, what such experience makes more evident is the bond between the two – that ultimately reciprocal process wherein one enables the other" (hooks 1991, 2).

The article *Refusals, radical vulnerability, and hungry translations* takes up a conversation with Richa Nagar about how questions of refusal emerge in her intellectual and political journey. We discuss the messy boundaries between academia and activism, divergent forms of dissenting subjectivities, and the power of their refusals. Nagar reflects on journeys with her saathis in multiple sites of engagement – multidimensional movement spaces of Sangtin Kisan Mazdoor Sangathan in Sitapur, the Parakh Theatre in Mumbai, and her classes at the University of Minnesota. She reflects on the categories of 'academic' and 'activist', and how these categories are "often simplistically presumed to be separate from one another, but their separation is also often problematically layered onto two other dichotomies: one between 'the intellectual' and 'the political' and another between 'the individual' and 'the collective'" (Nagar & Swarr 2010 in Nagar *et al*. 2023, 267). She explains that "The hierarchies engendered by this triple layering are central to the epistemic violence that often reduces lived struggles of movements and collectives to data or stories (read: activist, everyday, political, grassroots) to be explored, assembled, studied, and shaped into arguments by theorists and analysts (read: academic, intellectual, individual, expert)" (Nagar *et al*. 2023, 267). For Nagar, "knowledge is movement of the heart–mind–body–spirit. Such full-bodied movement mobilizes words, actions, art, dreams, and passions. One cannot learn objectively from such movements – we must, in fact, become movements" (Nagar *et al*. 2023, 268). She conceptualises "hungry translation" as a 'hunger' for movement; the "non-stop striving for ethical retelling – an ever evolving relation between self and other – where each one constantly works to listen, feel, trust, and retell ethically, despite the challenges of walking together on an uneven terrain, and despite an understanding that each retelling will be incomplete and imperfect" (Nagar *et al*. 2023, 270).

'Activism' is often portrayed as organised politics – protest events, meetings, boycotts, sit-ins – where people come together to speak about and act against systems of oppression. However, this special issue also emphasises the importance of practices, feelings, and engagements that are not

traditionally considered politically relevant in struggles for justice (see Spathopoulou & Meier 2020; Kallio *et al*. 2021). This includes an often invisibilised, embodied, and emotional activist praxis that Nagar calls a "praxis of love" (Nagar *et al*. 2023, 270).

Michele Lobo, Abha Bhagwat, and Dharmaraj Patils (2023, 240) explore "embodied feelings of generative more-than-human love" as an activist practice that refuses the slow, brutal violence of global warming and environmental pollution in India. Their article, *Performing arts of embodied refusal amid anthropogenic climate change: the Salim Ali Biodiversity Park and Bird Sanctuary, Pune, India*, takes us to Pune, a rapidly growing city in the state of Maharashtra in western India. The three co-authors' differently situated experiences engage in activist refusals of anthropogenic climate change and toxic environmental pollution. Their piece interrogates embodied performances – poetry, city walks, and a participatory mural painted by the Save Slim Ali Sanctuary Action Group – to illuminate how the slow violence of global warming and environmental pollution affects bird habitats, migratory routes, species diversity, and song. They demonstrate the potential of multilingual, transnational, and decolonial ecological activism as an embodied, feelings-based generative practice. The authors articulate embodied refusal as "place-based collective action and writing that is multilingual, visceral and generative in affirming bird life and thriving more-than-human worlds" (Lobo *et al*. 2023, 230)

This special issue also unpacks the transformative possibilities of turning away, withdrawing, and non-action as both politically engaged and a refusal to fit into specific norms. In hegemonic political spaces, practices of refusal are often read as giving up, passivity, or 'doing nothing'. However, as Kahina Meziant (2023, 245) asks, "do refusals have to be declared in order to be counted as such? What do we make of more oblique refusals?" Meziant's contribution, *On reading non-participation as refusal*, draws on her double role as a volunteer and PhD researcher at a northeast England charity supporting migrants' and refugees' social inclusion. She reflects on the charity's micropolitical dynamics; the organisation is unaware that they impede migrants' active participation and "contribute to [an] apparent passivity" (Meziant 2023, 244). Meziant discusses two types of refusals: noncompliance and departure. Members may not comply with charity leaders' expectations, either by quitting, not participating, or not adhering to arbitrary rules. The author proposes that "this assumed passivity reveals a paradox in [...] many charities aiming to centre the voices of people with lived experience" (Meziant 2023, 249). She advocates a more careful reading of asylum seekers' non-participation in UK charity activities supporting their social inclusion. Specifically, refusal as a concept should be applied to migration charities (and the non-profit sector in general) as it helps us deconstruct "the absence of participation and assumed apathy or indifference in light of a discrepancy between the organisation's intentions and the outcomes" (Meziant 2023, 244). Contextualising refusal practices within everyday struggles for justice allows us to move beyond dominant representations and binaries. It illustrates how refusal is not mere passivity or a single act of resistance, but an ongoing practice of relating to ourselves, others, and the world otherwise.

Many contributions to this special issue embrace everyday 'activist' praxis as a personal, academic, artistic, and political struggle. They use embodied experiences and feelings to interrogate broader social-historical structures, processes, and contexts shaped by coloniality, race, gender, patriarchy, ecological genocide, and citizenship status. The contributors complicate the figure of the 'activist-scholar' by revealing its nuanced positionalities; they write as academics, activists, poets, artists, educators, development practitioners, mothers, lovers, daughters, and sisters.

Refusals as ongoing journeys

This special issue and its contributions highlight practices of refusal as generative, collective, embodied, and hopeful. They are challenging labours of love and engagements with ourselves, others, and the world. We frame practices of refusal as *relating otherwise*; many contributions reveal the generative force of creating different knowledges, meaning-making, socialities, and care. The contributions also highlight creative ways to navigate and enliven everyday struggles for justice. There is no singular way to engage in abolitionist, decolonial practices of *relating otherwise*. Rather, this special issue showcases

multiple modes of engagement – day-to-day practices of love, care, connection, and healing. This resonates with Simpson's (2017, 245) definition of generative refusal as "withdraw from a politics of recognition and to instead turn inward to rebuild internally, to seek reciprocal recognition through meaningful relationships in the present".

At the same time, this special issue embodies the 'limitations' or, rather, 'incompleteness' of struggles for justice. As Siriwardane-de Zoysa *et al*. (2023, 180) emphasise in their contribution: "the active un/making of refusal as art and social/communicative practice is never work that is 'complete'". Many authors illustrate the inherent contradictions between one's (multiple) positionalities, activisms, and writings. The texts, poems, dialogues, images, and performances embody the unresolvable conflict(s) one has with one's self and the complex realities a person is engaged in. These unresolvable conflict(s), however, open up productive spaces of change and hope when we, in Nayak´s (2017, 208) words, "occupy the tensions, dialectics, aporia and inherent contradictions" instead of resolving them. Hartman (2008, 12) calls this the "as-yet-incomplete project of freedom," arguing that "the refusal to fill in the gaps and provide closure [...] is the imperative to respect black noise – the shrieks, the moans, the nonsense, and the opacity, which are always in excess of legibility and of the law and which hint at and embody aspirations that are wildly utopian, derelict to capitalism, and antithetical to its attendant discourse of Man". Conceptualising struggles for justice as 'incomplete' foregrounds the ever-*becoming* nature of theory and everyday 'activist' praxis from which hopes and futures grow. Nagar writes, "liberated theory is born in this braid, like flowers grow on a vine: it is immersed in ongoing journeys, it strives for ethical relationships, and it is committed to unstoppable dreams and labours that yearn for justice. And liberated theory does all of this without assuming a priori what justice or ethics look like in a given time, place, or struggle" (in Nagar *et al*. 2023, 271) We are inspired by Nagar's concept of the 'ongoing journey', in which, according to her, the hope for justice is found rather than "in the expectation of arrival" (Nagar *et al*. 2023, 271). Therefore, we dedicate this special issue to the continuation of the journey and the yearning that the practices of refusal narrated and enacted here will inspire us to imagine, think, dream, feel, and desire other ways of relating to ourselves, each other, and the world.

AILA SPATHOPOULOU (https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6563-5232)
DURHAM UNIVERSITY and the Feminist Autonomous Centre for research

ISABEL MEIER (https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7539-1104)
NORTHUMBRIA UNIVERSITY

Notes

[1] Sherry B. Ortner first described the term of ethnographic refusal as "a kind of bizarre refusal to know and speak and write of the lived worlds inhabited by those who resist" (Ortner 1995, 187–188). For her, this refusal results in 'thin' research on resistance and an ethnographically 'thin' description of 'internal politics of dominated groups'. She locates these refusals in the crisis of representation and (im)possibility of 'truthfully' portraying others, debates that were inspired by Edward Said´s work on Orientalism, Gayatri Spivak´s writings on the subaltern, and James Clifford´s engagement with ethnographies (Ortner 1995). While significant, Ortner's use of ethnographic refusal is conceptually different from how we approach the term in this special issue, so we have not included her in this section.

Acknowledgements

The authors are deeply grateful for the wonderful contributions to this special issue from all the authors, whose remarkable work inspired the collection. We would also like to thank all the reviewers who so kindly took the time to thoughtfully review the manuscripts and offer all of us insightful

comments. A special thank you to Rebecca Helman and Cetta Mainwaring whose comments and suggestions have been tremendously helpful to further develop our ideas and strengthen the arguments of this introduction.

Our work on this special issue as well as the research and writing of this introduction has been supported by Aila Spathopoulou´s ECR Leverhulme Fellowship ECF-2021-526: Refugee or return: changing spatio-temporalities of European refugee asylum and Isabel Meier´s ECR Leverhulme Fellowship ECF-2021-664: Everyday Politics of Survival and Hope at European Borderscapes.

References

Anderson, B., Sharma, N. & Wright, C. (2009) Why no borders?. *Refuge* 26 5. https://doi.org/10.25071/1920-7336.32074

Aparna, K. & Hamzah, S. (2023) Languaging as refusal. *Fennia* 201(2) 215–228. https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.122372

Barnard Centre for Research on Women (2014) Black feminist futures and the practice of fugitivity. [Video]. Helen Pond McIntyre '48 Lecture given by Tina Campt. 1.10.2014. <*https://bcrw.barnard.edu/black-feminist-futures-and-the-practice-of-fugitivity/*>. 25.10.2023.

BRIDGES Collective (2022) *Dismantling Walls, Building Bridges: Creating Antiracist Feminist Alliances Within, Outside, and Against Universities.* FAC Press, Athens. <*https://buildingbridges.space/wp-content/uploads/Monograph_EN.pdf*>.

Cahill, C., Alberto Quijada Cerecer, D., Reyna Rivarola, A. R., Hernández Zamudio, J. & Alvarez Gutiérrez, L. (2019) 'Caution, we have power': resisting the 'school-to-sweatshop pipeline' through participatory artistic praxes and critical care. *Gender and Education* 31(5) 576–589. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2019.1582207

Campt, T. M. (2017a) *Listening to Images.* Duke University Press, Durham. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780822373582

Campt, T. M. (2017b) Performing stillness: Diaspora and stasis in black German vernacular photography. *Qui Parle* 26(1) 155–170. https://doi.org/10.1215/10418385-3822457

Campt, T. M. (2019) Black visuality and the practice of refusal. *Women & Performance: a journal of feminist theory* 29(1) 79–87. https://doi.org/10.1080/0740770X.2019.1573625

Carastathis, A., Dadusc, D., Spathopoulou, A. & Tsilimpounidi, M. (forthcoming) Border Violence and Border Abolition. In Boulila, S., Brown, G, Browne, K., De Craene, V., Di Feliciantonio, C., Hartal, G., Filep, E. & Silva, J. M. (eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Sexualities and Space.*

Cassidy, K., Amiri, R. & Davidson, G. (2023) Reading for refusal in UK maternity care: entangling struggles for border and reproductive justice. *Fennia* 201(2) 199–214. https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.127866

Combahee River Collective (1977) 'A Black Feminist Statement'. In Guy-Sheftall, B. (ed.) *In Words of Fire: An Anthology of African-American Feminist Thought,* 210–218. New York, The New Press

Coultas, C. (2022) Accounting for colonial complicities through refusals in researching agency across borders. *Journal of Social Issues* 78(2) 413–433. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12473

Coulthard, G. (2010) Place against empire: understanding Indigenous anti-colonialism. *Affinities: A Journal of Radical Theory, Culture, and Action* 4(2) 79–83.

Coulthard, G. (2014) *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis. https://doi.org/10.5749/minnesota/9780816679645.001.0001

Cusicanqui, S. R. (2010) The notion of "Rights" and the paradoxes of postcolonial modernity: Indigenous peoples and women in Bolivia. *Qui Parle: Critical Humanities and Social Sciences* 18(2) 29–54. https://doi.org/10.5250/quiparle.18.2.29

Dutta, U. (2023) Reimagining the politics of belonging through counterstorytelling: a decolonial praxis of refusal and desire. *Qualitative Inquiry* 29(5) 539–550. https://doi.org/10.1177/10778004221118690

Feminist Autonomous Centre for research 2023 Call for Participants: Feminist No Borders Summer School: Abolitionist Care. <*https://feministresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/FNBSS-2023-CfP.pdf*>.

Fine, M., Tuck, E. & Yang, K. W. (2013) An intimate memoir of resistance theory. In Tuck, E. & Yang, K. W. (eds.) *Youth Resistance Research and Theories of Change*, 46–58. Routledge, London. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203585078

Gardner, K. & Clancy, D. (2017) From recognition to decolonization: an interview with Glen Coulthard. *Upping the Anti: A Journal of Theory and Action 19.*

Gross, L., Mashreghi, S. & Söderman, E. (2023) Refusal – opening otherwise forms of research. *Fennia* 201(2) 154–168. https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.120482

Hartman, S. (2008) Venus in two acts. *Small Axe: A Caribbean Journal of Criticism* 12(2) 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1215/-12-2-1
hooks, b. (1991) Theory as liberatory practice. *Yale Journal of Law & Feminism* 4(1) art. 2.
hooks, b. (1994) Confronting class in the classroom. In Darder, A., Baltodano, M. P. & Torres, R. D. (eds.) *The Critical Pedagogy Reader*, 142–150. Routledge, New York.
Joly, T. L., Longley, H., Wells, C. & Gerbrandt, J. (2018) Ethnographic refusal in traditional land use mapping: consultation, impact assessment, and sovereignty in the Athabasca oil sands region. *The Extractive Industries and Society* 5(2) 335–343. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2018.03.002
Jones, E. (2022) *Abolitionist Intimacies*. Fernwood Publishing, Halifax.
Jones, R. (2012) Spaces of refusal: rethinking sovereign power and resistance at the border. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 102(3) 685–699. https://doi.org/10.1080/00045608.2011.600193
Kallio, K. P. & Hyvärinen, P. (2017) A question of time – or academic subjectivity? *Fennia* 195(2) 121–124. https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.67834
Kallio, K. P., Meier, I. & Häkli, J. (2021) Radical Hope in asylum seeking: political agency beyond linear temporality. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 47(17) 4006–4022. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2020.1764344
Kaptani, E. (2023) A generative refusal: body inclusive methods with racialized women in knowledge creation. *Fennia* 201(2) 183–198. https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.127224
Karera, A. (2021) Black feminist philosophy and the politics of refusal. In Hall, K. Q. & Ásta (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Feminist Philosophy*, 109–119. Oxford University Press, Oxford. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190628925.013.9
Khosravi, S. (2019) Un anthropologue avec accent: approche auto-ethnographique. *Monde commun* 2(3) 162–178. https://doi.org/10.3917/moco.003.0162
Kramsch, O., Aparna, K. & Degu, H. (2015) Languaging the borders of Europe. *Social Sciences* 4(4) 1207–1228. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci4041207
Lafazani, O. (2021) The significance of the insignificant: borders, urban space, everyday life. *Antipode* 53(4) 1143–1160. https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12703
Lobo, M., Bhagwat, A. & Patil, D. (2023) Performing arts of embodied refusal amid anthropogenic climate change: the Salim Ali Biodiversity Park and Bird Sanctuary, Pune, India. *Fennia* 201(2) 229–242. https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.120219
Lugones, M. (2010) Toward a decolonial feminism. *Hypatia* 25(4) 742–759. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1527-2001.2010.01137.x
Maldonado-Torres, N. (2007) On the coloniality of being: contributions to the development of a concept. *Cultural Studies* 21(2–3) 240–270. https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380601162548
Martino, W. & Omercajic, K. (2021) A trans pedagogy of refusal: interrogating cisgenderism, the limits of antinormativity and trans necropolitics. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society* 29(5) 679–694. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2021.1912155
McGranahan, C. (2018) Refusal as political practice: citizenship, sovereignty, and Tibetan refugee status. *American Ethnologist* 45(3) 367–379. https://doi.org/10.1111/amet.12671
Meier, I. (2023) Acts of disengagement in border struggles: fugitive practices of refusal. *Antipode* 55(6) 1860–1876. https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12948
Meier, I. (2020) Affective border violence: mapping everyday asylum precarities across different spaces and temporalities. *Emotion, Space and Society* 37 100702. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emospa.2020.100702
Mengesha, L. G. & Padmanabhan, L. (2019) Introduction to performing refusal/refusing to perform. *Women & Performance: a journal of feminist theory* 29(1) 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1080/0740770X.2019.1574527
Meziant, K. (2023) On reading non-participation as refusal. *Fennia* 201(2) 243–252. https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.126844
Mignolo, W. (2011) *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options.* Duke University Press, Durham. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv125jqbw
Mitchell-Eaton, E. & Coddington, K. (2022) Refusal and migration research: new possibilities for feminist social science. In Mayer, T. & Tran, T. (eds.) *Displacement, Belonging, and Migrant Agency in the Face of Power*, 317–330. Routledge, London. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003170686-25
Murphy, M. (2017) Alterlife and decolonial chemical relations. *Cultural Anthropology* 32(4) 494–503. https://doi.org/10.14506/ca32.4.02
Nagar, R., Meier, I. & Spathopoulou, A. (2023) Refusals, radical vulnerability, and hungry translations – a conversation with Richa Nagar. *Fennia* 201(2) 266–272. https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.121797

Nagar, R. & Swarr, A. L. (2010) Theorizing transnational feminist praxis. In Swarr, A. L. & Nagar, R. (eds.) *Critical Transnational Feminist Praxis*, 1–20 SUNY, Albany.
Nayak, S. (2017) Location as method. *Qualitative Research Journal* 17(3) 202–216. https://doi.org/10.1108/QRJ-02-2017-0004
Nayak, S. (2019) Occupation of racial grief, loss as a resource: learning from 'The Combahee River collective Black feminist statement'. *Psychological Studies* 64 352–364. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12646-019-00527-w
Newhouse, L. S. (2021) On not seeking asylum: migrant masculinities and the politics of refusal. *Geoforum* 120 176–185. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2021.01.024
Noble, G. (2005) The discomfort of strangers: racism, incivility and ontological security in a relaxed and comfortable nation. *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 26(1–2) 107–120. https://doi.org/10.1080/07256860500074128
Nxumalo, F. (2021) Disrupting anti-Blackness in early childhood qualitative inquiry: thinking with Black refusal and Black futurity. *Qualitative Inquiry* 27(10) 1191–1199. https://doi.org/10.1177/10778004211021810
Ortner, S. B. (1995) Resistance and the problem of ethnographic refusal. *Comparative studies in society and history* 37(1) 173–193. https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822388456
Pain, R. (2015) Intimate war. *Political Geography* 44 64–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2014.09.011
Prasse-Freeman, E. (2022) Resistance/refusal: politics of manoeuvre under diffuse regimes of governmentality. *Anthropological theory* 22(1) 102–127. https://doi.org/10.1177/1463499620940218
Quijano, A. (2000) Coloniality of power and Eurocentrism in Latin America. *International Sociology* 15(2) 215–232. https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580900015002005
Raheja, M. H. (2015) Visual sovereignty. In Teves, S. N., Smith, A. & Raheja, M. H. (eds.) *Native Studies Keywords*, 25–34. University of Arizona Press, Tucson. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt183gxzb.6
Raymond, Z. & Canham, H. (2022) Women's refusal of racial patriarchy in South African academia. *Gender and Education* 34(8) 991–1008. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2022.2101201
Rodríguez, Y. (2019) Pedagogies of refusal. *The Radical Teacher* (115) 5–12. https://doi.org/10.5195/rt.2019.672
Rosa, L. O. (2022) Luisa Capetillo and the pedagogy of unruliness. *Small Axe: A Caribbean Journal of Criticism* 26(3) 84–97. https://doi.org/10.1215/07990537-10211892
Rowe, A. C. & Tuck, E. (2017) Settler colonialism and cultural studies: ongoing settlement, cultural production, and resistance. *Cultural Studies <-> Critical Methodologies* 17(1) 3–13. https://doi.org/10.1177/1532708616653693
Shange, S. (2019) Black girl ordinary: flesh, carcerality, and the refusal of ethnography. *Transforming Anthropology* 27(1) 3–21. https://doi.org/10.1111/traa.12143
da Silva, D. F. (2018) Hacking the subject: Black feminism and refusal beyond the limits of critique. *PhiloSOPHIA* 8(1) 19–41. https://doi.org/10.1353/phi.2018.0001
Simpson, A. (2007) On ethnographic refusal: Indigeneity, 'voice' and colonial citizenship. *Junctures: The Journal for Thematic Dialogue* (9).
Simpson, A. (2014) *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States*. Duke University Press, Durham. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780822376781
Simpson, A. (2016) Consent's revenge. *Cultural Anthropology* 31(3) 326–333. https://doi.org/10.14506/ca31.3.02
Simpson, A. (2017) The ruse of consent and the anatomy of 'refusal': cases from indigenous North America and Australia. *Postcolonial Studies* 20(1) 18–33. https://doi.org/10.1080/13688790.2017.1334283
Simpson, L. B. (2015) The place where we all live and work together. In Teves, S. N., Smith, A. & Raheja, M. H. (eds.) *Native Studies Keywords* 18–24. Arizona University Press, Tuscon. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt183gxzb.5
Siriwardane-de Zoysa, R., Sreekanta, V., Mwambari, D., Mehta, S. & Majumder, M. (2023) The unruly arts of ethnographic refusal: power, politics, performativity. *Fennia* 201(2) 169–182. https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.121832
Sojoyner, D. M. (2017) Another life is possible: Black fugitivity and enclosed places. *Cultural Anthropology* 32(4) 514–536. https://doi.org/10.14506/ca32.4.04
Spathopoulou, A. & Carastathis, A. (2020) Hotspots of resistance in a bordered reality. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 38(6) 1067–1083. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263775820906167
Spathopoulou, A. & Meier, I. (2020) Turning the gaze upon power: refusal as research in/to and against the EU border regime. Discover Society. 1.4.2020. <*https://archive.discoversociety.org/2020/04/01/turning-the-gaze-upon-power-refusal-as-research-in-to-and-against-the-eu-border-regime/*>. 25.11.2023.

Spivak G. C. (1999) *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvjsf541
Thompson, V. E. (2021) Policing in Europe: disability justice and abolitionist intersectional care. *Race & Class* 62(3) 61–76. https://doi.org/10.1177/0306396820966463
Torkaman Rad, E. (2023) Radical understanding: reflections on knowledge production, power, positionality, and practices of refusal within academic research. *Fennia* 201(2) 253–260. https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.124992
Tuck, E. & Yang, K. W. (2014) Unbecoming claims: pedagogies of refusal in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry* 20(6) 811–818. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800414530265
Tuck, E. & Yang, K. W. (2021) Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Tabula Rasa* (38) 61–111. https://doi.org/10.25058/20112742.n38.04.
Wright, S. (2018) When dialogue means refusal. *Dialogues in Human Geography* 8(2) 128–132. https://doi.org/10.1177/2043820618780570
Wrightson, K. R. (2020) Generative refusal: creative practice and relational indigenous sovereignty. *Borderlands Journal* 19(2) 157–171. https://doi.org/10.21307/borderlands-2020-013
Wynter, S. (1979) A utopia from the semi-periphery: Spain, modernization, and the enlightenment. *Science Fiction Studies* 6(1) 100–110.
Yuval-Davis, N., Wemyss, G. & Cassidy, K. (2019) *Bordering*. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken.
Zahara, A. (2016) Ethnographic refusal: a how to guide. Discard Studies. 08.08.2016. <*https://discardstudies.com/2016/08/08/ethnographic-refusal-a-how-to-guide/#:~:text=Ethnographic%20refusal%20is%20a%20practice,issues%20on%20their%20own%20terms*>. 23.11.2023.
Zelenska, V. (2023) An article that refuses to write itself. *Fennia* 201(2) 261–265. https://doi.org/10.11143/fennia.138059